END
DATE
FILMED
7 8!
DTIC

TAEG

TRAINING
ANALYSIS
AND
EVALUATION
GROUP

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 101

LEVEL II

AN ASSESSMENT OF
LEADERSHIP TRAINING
REQUIREMENTS FOR
NAVY RECRUIT TRAINING
DIVISION OFFICERS

(12)

DTIC
S ELECTE
JUN 1 6 1981

APRIL 1981

FOCUS ON THE T ... SON

AD A100278

TRAINING ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION GROUP
ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32813

TAEG Report No. 101

AN ASSESSMENT OF LEADERSHIP TRAINING REQUIREMENTS
FOR NAVY RECRUIT TRAINING DIVISION OFFICERS

Herschel Hughes, Jr.
Charles A. Beagles
Douglas R. Copeland

Training Analysis and Evaluation Group

April 1981

Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	X
DTIC TAB	
Unannounced	
Justification	
By	
Di	
Dist	
A	

ALFRED F. SMODE, Ph.D., Director,
Training Analysis and Evaluation Group

W. L. MALOY, Ed.D.
Deputy Chief of Naval Education and
Training for Educational Development/
Research, Development, Test, and
Evaluation

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER TAEG Report No. 101	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A100 278	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) AN ASSESSMENT OF LEADERSHIP TRAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR NAVY RECRUIT TRAINING DIVISION OFFICERS.		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Herschel Hughes, Jr.; Charles A. Beagles; Douglas R. Copeland		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Training Analysis and Evaluation Group Orlando, FL 32813		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS		12. REPORT DATE April 1981
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 56
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Leadership Training	Enlisted Initial Entry Training
Recruit Training	
Leadership in Navy Recruit Training	
Officer Training	

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

This study assessed the requirement for leadership training for Recruit Training Command (RTC) division officers and, to the extent a requirement may exist, identified relevant training objectives.
The report contains a detailed analysis of selected aspects of leadership training for RTC officers.

DD _{1 JAN 73} 1473   EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

In 1978, the Chief of Naval Education and Training (CNET) directed the Training Analysis and Evaluation Group (TAEG) to undertake a series of studies addressing the optimization of the Navy recruit training system for the post-1980s.[1] Included in this effort have been reports addressing:

- an assessment of current recruit and apprenticeship training and exploration of future concepts (Copeland, Henry, Mew, and Cordell, 1976; Copeland, Mew, Henry, and Curry, 1978)

- the selection and training of recruit company commanders (Curry, Copeland, Henry, and Mew, 1978)

- a comprehensive and detailed recruit training system design with a plan for implementation (Copeland, Henry, and Mew, 1978).

The latest effort in this series concerns Recruit Training Command (RTC) officers, primarily those at the initial officer supervisory level--the recruit division. TAEG Report No. 81, Selection, Training, and Utilization of Navy Recruit Training Command Officers (Curry and Copeland, 1980), contains general recommendations for more effective preparation of the officer corps for duty in Navy recruit training.

This present report contains a detailed analysis of selected aspects of leadership training for RTC officers.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Data acquired in the analysis of division officer selection, training, and utilization included information about current specialized leadership training for Marine Corps, Army, and Air Force officers performing similar functions in enlisted initial entry training (IET). This information led to the examination of typical officer leadership guidance/training which is included in Navy RTC orientation procedures. It was determined that such training was beyond the scope of typical orientation procedures and that the development of additional leadership skills was necessarily consigned to a short period of "shadow" time of the individual being relieved and to on-the-job experience. Discussions were held with division officers at all three Navy RTCs concerning their perceived need/desire for more formal leadership training. These discussions gave the impression that a keen interest exists among many division officers in the expansion of current job orientation/training programs to include a segment dealing with recruit division officer leadership skills.

Another factor in the broadened evaluation of RTC division officer training requirements, in the area of leadership, is the unique nature of

---

[1]CNET ltr Code N-211 of 19 January 1978.

the RTC division within both the Navy and the Department of Defense (DOD). The aspects of the RTC division that signaled the desirability of further study were the high numbers and seniority of petty officers within the infrastructure of the division, low division officer rank with limited management experience, and an incredibly large span of control in numbers of people supervised.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to assess the requirement for leadership training for RTC division officers and, to the extent a requirement may exist, identify relevant training objectives.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The remainder of this report is presented in four sections and four appendices. Section II describes the instruments and procedures used to collect information about possible training needs. Details of data processing are also given. Specific survey results are contained in section III. Observations and comments concerning data interpretation are given in section IV. Conclusions which can be drawn from the data and recommendations concerning RTC division officer leadership training needs are given in section V. Appendices A and B contain copies of the survey materials used to gather data. Appendix C contains the mean rating scale values for all surveyed tasks. Responses to specific questions about personal job rewards and opinions about the major challenges facing recruit training are contained in appendix D.

SECTION II

TECHNICAL APPROACH

This section describes the procedures used to obtain, process, and evaluate data about specialized leadership training needs of division officers at the RTCs. The discussion covers the method chosen, the respondent population, the instruments and procedures developed to gather the data, and the data reduction/analysis methods employed.

METHOD

A formal survey procedure was developed for evaluation of specialized leadership training needs. This procedure was chosen by TAEG in order to present selected ideas about leadership training to a sample of RTC officers and to enable quantitative comparisons of survey responses that would be helpful in determining possible leadership training requirements.

Data collection instruments and procedures were designed to gather information about

- division officers' professional background prior to their RTC assignment
- recruit training division officer job tasks that might be performed more effectively with additional leadership training.

The first category provides information useful for assessing the existing levels of leadership expertise and training. The second identifies specific job performance areas that might be aided by additional leadership training. Such specific information is of obvious value in determining the need for and nature of leadership curriculum development.

RESPONDENTS. Forty-three respondents from the three Navy RTCs were selected for survey by their respective commands. Thirty were unrestricted line officers (ULOs) and 13 were either Limited Duty Officers (LDOs) or Chief Warrant Officers (CWOs). The officers selected for survey had (1) completed a period of assignment as a recruit division officer or (2) were currently serving in that capacity or (3) were anticipating division officer duty. All completed the questionnaire during September and October 1979. Table 1 identifies the number of officers surveyed by RTC and type of commission (ULO vs. LDO/CWO).

TABLE 1. NUMBER OF OFFICERS SURVEYED BY
COMMAND AND TYPE COMMISSION

| Type Commission | COMMAND | | | |
	RTC San Diego	RTC Great Lakes	RTC Orlando	Total
ULO	11	8	11	30
LDO/CWO	7	3	3	13
Total	18	11	14	43

MATERIALS. The materials used consisted of two documents: the survey
instrument titled Training Analysis and Evaluation Group Recruit Training
Command Officer Training Survey and a Background Data Form. See appendices A
and B, respectively, for a copy of the survey form and background data form.

Training Analysis and Evaluation Group Recruit Training Command Officer
Training Survey. The survey items consisted of 51 RTC division officer job
tasks. The survey items were generated from two sources. The primary
source was a series of unstructured interviews of 30 RTC line and supporting
staff corps officers. The interviews were conducted in both individual and
small group settings. The comments of the officers interviewed concerned the
desirability of a formal training program in general (see TAEG Report 81),
and the inclusion of leadership training in particular, as well as suggested
topics for the leadership portion. The majority of officers interviewed
supported the concept of providing formal leadership training for new officers
assigned to an RTC. There were some, however, who expressed the opinion that
previous fleet experience provided adequate preparation for an RTC assignment.
The officers who considered formal leadership training desirable made numerous
suggestions for training topics in the areas of:

- general management
- effective leadership of company commanders
- personal leadership of recruits.

There was some interest in formal training for increasing or enhancing
personal coping skills related to the stress of the RTC environment.

The second source of potential RTC division officer job tasks was
Supplement 1 to TAEG Report No. 67, Navy Recruit Training Optimization,
Post-1980: Training System Design and a Plan for Implementation (Copeland,
Henry, and Mew, 1978). The curriculum topics contained in that supplement
are the formal curricular topics currently taught in recruit classroom instruc-
tion as well as those topics recommended for future recruit training curricula.
The instructional topics from TAEG Report No. 67 were specifically included

in order to determine which topics may be relevant to officers' interactions with recruits. The survey items identified from TAEG Report No. 67 were mainly concerned with teaching/counseling recruits about the military and career aspects of the Naval service.

Three categories of respondent information were gathered on each of the potential 51 job tasks: (1) how frequently that respondent performed the task, (2) the level of preparation of each respondent upon initial performance of the job task, and (3) the desirability of formal training for a particular task. A three-point scale for each of the three categories was used. The anchor points for the frequency of performance category consisted of "never," "occasionally," and "frequently"; the anchor points for the level of preparation category were "not at all," "adequately," and "well"; and the anchor points for the desirability of formal training category were "not necessary," "desirable, but not essential," and "essential." Each category's anchor points were assigned a numerical value of 0, 1, or 2, respectively.

Background Data Form. A background data form was developed to collect information about each officer surveyed. This included career background information as well as opinions about various aspects of an RTC assignment. The career background information requested was rank, designator, years commissioned service, years enlisted service (if applicable), highest enlisted rating attained (if applicable), previous billet and type of command, number of weeks between reporting aboard RTC and commencing duties as a division officer, career plans following the RTC assignment, and formal training in the behavioral sciences. The background data form contained one question about whether or not assignment to an RTC was requested. Two additional questions solicited opinions about the personal rewards involved in working at an RTC and the major challenges facing recruit training in the future.

PROCEDURES

The training survey and background data form were distributed to designated command representatives, usually the Executive Officer, at each RTC. The command representative selected the officers for participation in the survey based upon TAEG's request to include officers with RTC division officer experience. While the names of respondents were not solicited, anonymity was not provided. Initial distribution to, and possible subsequent review by, a senior command officer was made clear to the respondents. This was done to encourage interest and dialog concerning the need and/or desirability of division officer training among officers within each RTC. Following their review, command representatives returned the surveys to a TAEG representative.

SECTION III

RESULTS

The data obtained from the survey and background data instruments are contained in this section. Two analyses of survey data and a comparison of ULO and LDO/CWO background data are also included.

TRAINING SURVEY ANALYSIS

Two assumptions were made regarding the survey data set. First, it was assumed that there were no measurable differences in RTC division officer responsibilities among the three RTC environments. Therefore, the survey data from the three RTCs were combined. Second, it was assumed that there is an equal interval between rating scale anchor points (e.g., that the significance of the interval between "never" performed and "occasionally" performed is the same as that between "occasionally" performed and "frequently" performed).

Two analyses were performed on the training survey data. First, mean ratings over all survey items for each response category (frequency of performance, level of preparation, and desirability of formal training) were calculated separately for the LDO/CWO and ULO officer groups. The differences in means of the two groups for each response category were tested for statistical significance using a standard t test. Second, a rank order correlation was calculated between the means of the rating scale values assigned each item by the LDO/CWO and ULO groups on the desirability of formal training scale. To establish rank data, each item was ranked according to mean ratings assigned within each officer group.

In interpreting the implications for training of the survey data, survey items (job task areas) having mean desirability of formal training ratings ranging from 0 to .49 are assumed to not require training. Survey items (job task areas) with mean desirability values ranging from .50 to 1.49 are considered "desirable for training," and items (areas) with mean desirability values ranging from 1.5 to 2.0 are considered "essential for training."

Analysis of the rank order data revealed that 38 tasks had a desirability of formal training mean of 1.0 (the numerical anchor point of training desirable, but not essential response category) or higher by the LDO/CWO group. Five tasks earned a mean of 1.5 (the threshold of "training essential" response choice category) or higher by the same group. Only one task earned a desirability of formal training mean of 1.0 or higher by the ULO group.

The rank order of desirability of formal training means for all tasks for both groups of officers is contained in table 2. The rank order correlation is .62. This suggests that both groups of officers tend to prioritize the tasks for formal training similarly. There are, however, several important exceptions. The LDO/CWO mean ratings resulted in a higher (15 or more) rank order to several survey items (e.g., task numbers 36, 44, 32, 39, 17, and 48). Similarly, the ULO mean ratings resulted in a higher (15 or more) rank order to several survey items (e.g., task numbers 6, 3, 14, 4, 2,

TABLE 2. RANK ORDERED* MEAN DESIRABILITY OF FORMAL TRAINING RATINGS OF SELECTED RECRUIT TRAINING COMMAND DIVISION OFFICER JOB TASKS

Survey Item Number	Task	LDO/CWO	ULO
23.	Inform recruits of positive aspects of Navy as an employer, in conjunction with counseling sessions (e.g., educational programs, advancement, pay, medical benefits, travel, chance to switch ratings)	1.75(1)	.97(2.5)
29.	Inform recruits of types of discharges and benefits gained or lost as a result of each, emphasizing effects of certain type discharges on the individual's future opportunities	1.55(2)	.93(5)
31.	Choose the disposition for poorly motivated and/or misbehaving recruits that will optimize his/her chances for successful completion of training (e.g., refer to chaplain, NJP, Special Training Division, RTD)	1.50(4)	.90(8)
40.	Recognize need for and maintain control of recruit's behavior when he/she may be trying to create maximum uproar through expanding the seriousness of his/her misbehavior/acting out (e.g., suicide gestures, threats of going UA, getting staff members pitted against one another.)	1.50(4)	.97(2.5)
41.	Change chronic failure oriented recruit behavior (e.g., recruit dropped out of school, ran away from home, was fired from job, now wants out of Navy, and has good "A" school)	1.50(4)	.93(5)
42.	Distinguish which recruits to recommend for unsuitability discharge and which to return to duty (e.g., situations that occur in Division Officer Mast, RAPs, RABs)	1.42(6)	.90(8)
17.	Distinguish which recruits with whom to invest the majority of available discussion/counseling time	1.36(8)	.75(27)
28.	Coordinate disposition of recruits referred to various support personnel for assistance/disposition (i.e., exchange correspondence, discuss disposition rationale, resolve differences, effect disposition)	1.36(8)	.89(10.5)

* Ranks are indicated by the number in parentheses. Items are listed according to LDO/CWO ranks.

TABLE 2. RANK ORDERED* MEAN DESIRABILITY OF FORMAL TRAINING RATINGS OF SELECTED RECRUIT TRAINING COMMAND DIVISION OFFICER JOB TASKS (continued)

Survey Item Number	Task	LDO/CWO	ILO
43.	Interpret significance of recruit's past history of psychiatric care and/or alcohol/drug abuse on suitability for training	1.36(9)	1.00(1)
19.	Distinguish between occasions in a recruit counseling session when direct/indirect counseling techniques would be most helpful	1.33(11.5)	.86(15.5)
22.	Assign punishment to a recruit(s) for performing an unacceptable behavior or expressing an unacceptable attitude	1.33(11.5)	.79(23)
30.	Distinguish between recruits progressing slowly primarily because of a need for academic remediation and those progressing slowly primarily because of a lack of motivation for Navy life	1.33(11.5)	.86(15.5)
39.	Listen to a recruit talk about a training and/or personal problem (i.e., facilitate his expression of feelings, definition of problem, exploration of options)	1.33(11.5)	.72(30.5)
12.	Monitor potential for divisional staff/company commander/recruit maltreatment of recruits	1.31(15)	.87(12.5)
27.	Distinguish between various support personnel for referral of recruits for assistance/disposition (e.g., psychologist, chaplain, medical officer, legal officer)	1.31(15)	.79(23)
49.	Cope with multiple command/departmental/divisional goals that may, at times, seem to oppose each other (e.g., maintain low attrition while screening out unsuitable recruits)	1.31(15)	.73(28)
36.	Instruct recruits in basic mission and roles of the Navy and potential enemy threats	1.30(17.5)	.57(44)
44.	Coordinate with medical officer concerning optimum training/health care disposition for recruit patients	1.30(17.5)	.61(41)

* Ranks are indicated by the number in parentheses. Items are listed according to LDO/CWO ranks.

13

TABLE 2.   RANK ORDERED* MEAN DESIRABILITY OF FORMAL TRAINING RATINGS OF
SELECTED RECRUIT TRAINING COMMAND DIVISION OFFICER JOB TASKS (continued)

Survey Item Number	Task	LDO/CWO	ULO
32.	Instruct recruits in the proper use of the chain-of-command and the responsibilities inherent in General Order 21	1.27(19)	.62(39)
18.	Distinguish between recruits who may accept directive counseling (e.g., advice giving, pep talks, verbal punishments) from those that may be more effectively helped from indirect means (e.g., listening, ventilation of feelings)	1.25(21.5)	.86(15.5)
46.	Coordinate with psychologist/psychiatrist concerning optimum training/ health care disposition for recruits with past history or current involvement with psychiatric care, suicide attempts/gestures, alcohol/ drug abuse, etc.	1.25(21.5)	.83(19)
47.	Cope with day-to-day stress of managing/counseling large adolescent population	1.25(21.5)	.79(23)
48.	Adjust to increase in perceived personal power that may seem to accrue (e.g., avoid warden/prisoner syndrome)	1.25(21.5)	.63(37)
21.	Punish verbally a recruit(s) for unacceptable behavior/attitude	1.23(24.5)	.62(39)
24.	Inform recruits of necessary negative aspects of Navy as an employer, in conjunction with counseling sessions (e.g., separations from family, arduous sea duty, frequent reassignments)	1.23(24.5)	.72(30.5)
11.	Coach company commanders and division staff members on their training unit's marginally acceptable/unacceptable behavior (e.g., slow progress in training, poor discipline in ranks)	1.18(26.5)	.90(8)
45.	Coordinate with legal officer concerning optimum training/legal dispostion for recruits with legal problems (e.g., fraudulent enlistments, UA)	1.18(26.5)	.66(35.5)

* Ranks are indicated by the number in parentheses. Items are listed according to LDO/CWO ranks.

TABLE 2.   RANK ORDERED* MEAN DESIRABILITY OF FORMAL TRAINING RATINGS OF
SELECTED RECRUIT TRAINING COMMAND DIVISION OFFICER JOB TASKS (continued)

Survey Item Number	Task	LDO/CWO	LLO
35.	Conduct barracks inspections as an evaluation of training unit and individual progress	1.00(36)	.83(19)
5.	Submit written recommendations for improvements in command/departmental/divisional behavior and attitude problems	.92(39)	.53(48)
33.	Encourage, verbally, optimum performance from groups of recruits (e.g., training unit pep talks, sports day briefings)	.91(40)	.55(46.5)
3.	Apply theories and research findings found in current human resource management literature to correct command/departmental/divisional behavior and attitude problems	.85(41.5)	.86(15.5)
7.	Achieve compliance by division staff members and company commanders with changes in command/departmental/divisional policy and directives	.85(41.5)	.66(35.5)
8.	Achieve/maintain division officer authority over daily operation of division	.83(43)	.60(42)
13.	Discuss/resolve differences of opinion with division staff members about recommended recruit dispositions	.82(44.5)	.63(33)
16.	Reinforce acceptable recruit behavior and attitudes with rewards (e.g., verbal compliments, high evaluation marks, awards)	.82(44.5)	.52(49)
15.	Monitor potential for division staff/company commander/recruit use of abusive language toward recruits	.77(46)	.45(51)
9.	Achieve/maintain respect and credibility with division staff members and assigned company commanders	.75(47.5)	.57(44)
51.	Adjust to going from enlisted status to LDO/CWO status	.75(47.5)	.67(34)

* Ranks are indicated by the number in parentheses. Items are listed according to LDO/CWO ranks.

15

TABLE 2. RANK ORDERED* MEAN DESIRABILITY OF FORMAL TRAINING RATINGS OF SELECTED RECRUIT TRAINING COMMAND DIVISION OFFICER JOB TASKS (continued)

Survey Item Number	Task	LDO/CWO	ULO
6.	Reinforce acceptable behavior and attitudes of division staff members and company commanders with rewards (e.g., verbal compliments, high marks on evaluations, awards)	.69(49)	.83(19)
1.	Apply fleet experience to correct command/departmental/divisional behavior and attitude problems	.67(50.5)	.57(44)
50.	Adjust to assignment at RTC (e.g., plan career based on influence of assignment, adjust from variety of sea duty to routine of shore duty, develop personally challenging job role, adjust to decreased contact between officers due to different buildings/distances)	.67(50.5)	.50(50)

* Ranks are indicated by the number in parentheses. Items are listed according to LDO/CWO ranks.

16

11, and 35). These tasks tend to cluster around three areas. The tasks given a relatively higher priority for training by the LDO/CWOs involve primarily their relationships with recruits. The tasks given relatively higher priority by the ULOs are concerned with their relationships with senior enlisted staff members and the application of management theory/ research to their job.

Rating scale values for all response categories for all surveyed tasks by type officer are contained in appendix C.

The overall mean ratings assigned by ULOs and LDO/CWOs on all three scales are summarized in table 3. The possible range for each response category was 0.0 to 2.0.

TABLE 3. MEANS OF THE RATING SCALE VALUES OVER ALL TASKS
BY CATEGORY AND OFFICER GROUP

Category	Type Officer	Mean Rating for All Tasks
Frequency of Performance	ULO	1.45
	LDO/CWO	1.29
Level of Preparation	ULO	1.36
	LDO/CWO	1.50
Desirability of Formal Training	ULO	.75
	LDO/CWO	1.14

The mean ratings assigned by the LDO/CWOs vs ULOs were significantly different on all three scales. The ULO group reported more frequent performance of the listed tasks than the LDO/CWO group although the means for both groups indicate moderately frequent performance of the tasks by each group. The LDO/CWO group reported a significantly higher opinion of their level of preparation for the performance of the listed tasks. However, both groups indicated that they were adequately prepared to perform these tasks. The LDO/CWO group indicated a significantly higher level of desire for formal training in the listed tasks as a whole; however, both groups tended to assess formal training in these tasks as desirable but not essential.

BACKGROUND DATA ANALYSIS

Information provided on the background data forms showed a wide range of experience for the 43 officers surveyed. Several expected but notable differences exist between LDO/CWOs and ULOs. First, the LDO/CWO group indicated an average, per officer, of 14.9 more years of Naval service--2.3 more years of commissioned service and 12.6 more years in an enlisted status. Second, all members of the LDO/CWO group completed a period of enlisted service which was terminated in the E-6 to E-9 rates. Thirty-eight percent were former E-9s. The members of the ULO group that had enlisted status at some point prior to commissioning finished at the E-3 to E-5 level, and 80 percent had

no previous enlisted experience. Third, a lower percentage of members of the
LDO/CWO group reported formal training in human behavior in either under-
graduate and graduate college courses or the Navy's leadership courses.
LDO/CWOs reported a higher percentage of volunteers for RTC duty and, simi-
larly, a higher percentage of LDO/CWOs anticipated further active duty
assignments after their RTC tours. Table 4 contains a comparison of back-
ground data for both groups.

Comments recorded in the collection of background data concerning
personal job rewards and opinions about the major challenges facing recruit
training are contained in appendix D.

TABLE 4.   COMPARISON OF ELEMENTS IN LDO/CWO AND
ULO BACKGROUND DATA

Element		Officer Group	
		LDO/CWO	ULO
Rank (Frequency):	W-1	0	NA
	W-2	2	NA
	W-3	0	NA
	W-4	4	NA
	O-1	0	1
	O-2	3	2
	O-3	2	25
	O-4	0	1
	Not indicated	2	1
Designator:			
1100/1105 (Not designated)		NA	7
1110/1115 (Surface Warfare Specialist)		NA	16
1310/1315 (Aviation Warfare Specialist, Pilot)		NA	3
1320/1325 (Aviation Warfare Specialist, Naval Flight Officer)		NA	1
6111 (Deck, Surface)		2	NA
6112 (Deck, Surface)		1	NA
6131 (Engineering/Repair, Surface)		1	NA
6331 (Aviation Maintenance)		1	NA
7110 (Boatswain's Mate)		1	NA
7112 (Boatswain's Mate)		1	NA
7122 (Operations Technician)		1	NA
7142 (Repair Technician)		1	NA
7182 (Electronic Technician)		1	NA
7222 (Operations Technician, Submarine)		1	NA
7261 (Ordnance Technician, Submarine)		1	NA
Not indicated		1	1
Percent Requesting RTC Assignment		67	28
Percent Anticipating Remaining on Active Duty After RTC Assignment		64	45
Average Number of Weeks Between Reporting Aboard and Assignment as Division Officer		3.2	3.5
Average Years Commissioned Service		7.4	5.1
Average Years Enlisted Service		13.3	.7

TABLE 4. COMPARISON OF ELEMENTS IN LDO/CWO AND
ULO BACKGROUND DATA (continued)

	Officer Group	
Element	LDO/CWO	ULO
Highest Enlisted Rate Attained (Percentages):		
E-3	0	3
E-4	0	7
E-5	0	7
E-6	8	0
E-7	38	0
E-8	8	0
E-9	38	0
Not Applicable	0	80
Not Indicated	8	3
Formal Training in Human Behavior (Percentages):		
Graduate Level College Courses	10	27
Undergraduate Level College Courses	40	45
LMT/LMET	40	55
Human Resource Management School	10	5
Drug and Alcohol Program Officer Course	0	9
Race Awareness Training	0	9
Career Counselor Course	10	5
Legal Officer Course	0	5
Instructor Training Course	20	0

SECTION IV

DISCUSSION

This section provides observations and comments concerning the value and interpretation of the data obtained. Implications derived from supplemental information about existing DOD IET officer training, recruit division organization/staffing, and different levels of RTC division officer leadership experience are also discussed.

VALUE OF DATA

Respondent sample representativeness and selected job task relevancy are two aspects of the survey data that bear on its value.

SAMPLE REPRESENTATIVENESS. The 43 officers surveyed within the three RTCs represented a major portion (approximately one-half) of the officers who were then assigned to an RTC that had recent experience serving as a division officer. These individuals had a wide range and breadth of experience and education. It is believed that they comprised a fair and representative sample of RTC division officers. No reasons are apparent for believing that their opinions about division officer training would differ significantly from their counterparts who were not surveyed. Thus, the data provided by these officers can be considered valid.

RELEVANCE OF THE SURVEYED JOB TASKS. Several indicators exist with which selected survey job task statements can be judged to be relevant to the actual job. Consideration of criticality to job success, consequence of first performance failure, and frequency of performance on the job are three possible measures. The frequency of performance was selected as the primary indicator of the job relevance of survey items in this instance because a simple and straight-forward check on general overall relevance was desired. A definitive analysis of the job criticality of each selected task was considered beyond the scope of this effort. The mean frequency of performance rating for all tasks indicates that both groups of officers perform the listed tasks fairly frequently. Only 3 of the 51 tasks received a mean frequency of performance rating below 1.0 (occasional performance) by either officer group. Based on the reports of fairly frequent performance of the tasks as a whole, along with the absence of many notable exceptions, the surveyed tasks can be considered relevant to the recruit division officer job.

INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to conduct a needs assessment to ascertain the requirement for specialized leadership training for RTC division officers. In general, the results show that in the virtual absence of such training at the present time, specialized leadership training is desirable for both the ULO and LDO/CWO groups; however, important similarities and differences exist in training needs between groups. The remainder of this section discusses:

- the implications of the study results

• areas of commonality and divergence between each group's specialized leadership training needs.

SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS. Survey data analysis revealed that the ULO group endorsed training in 50 of the 51 job tasks and the LDO/CWO group supported training in all 51 tasks. This indicates both officer groups desire additional specialized leadership training.

Both groups indicated they performed the listed tasks fairly frequently and perceived themselves, in general, as adequately prepared for their current assignment. These findings are important and imply that in spite of frequent performance and generally adequate preparation, they desire additional training in virtually all of the surveyed job tasks.

Further examination of category data does, however, reveal significant differences between officer groups in all three categories. The ULO group tends to report higher frequency of performance, relatively lower perception of their level of job preparation, but a surprisingly lower (relative to the LDO/CWOs) endorsement of formal training.

Analysis would suggest (at least superficially) that the group reporting more frequent performance at certain tasks and a lower degree of adequacy of preparation would possess a greater desire for formal training at those tasks. The anomaly increases with analysis of individual job task data which reveals five job tasks indicated by the LDO/CWO group as critical/essential for training.

It is unclear as to why the ULO group reported higher frequency of performance, lower adequacy of preparation yet lower desire for training, while the LDO/CWO group reported lower frequency of performance, higher adequacy of preparation yet higher desire for formal training to the point of identifying five job tasks as critical/essential for formal training.

Perhaps this anomaly resulted from the lack of anonymity in the survey. All surveys were available for review by individuals' commands. It is speculated that the ULOs may have been more hesitant to advertise high need/desire for formal training because of possible implications of inadequacy. The LDO/CWOs, being older and at more advanced stages of their careers and possibly freed somewhat from this constraint, may have expressed their ideas more openly. There is no specific data to confirm this, but field researchers while conducting preliminary discussions did experience a high degree of correlation between junior officer opinion about formal division officer training and command "opinion" when that was openly stated. In instances when no command "opinion" was offered, junior ULO officers subsequently reflected high interest in formal training and suggested many of the topics that led to survey job task statements. Methodological procedures designed to foster communication/discussion about officer training needs may have created some distortion in the ULO data. Other explanations such as differing officer attitudes about the usefulness/practicality of training in leadership/behavioral areas may also bear on the interpretation of the data.

Any discussion of the desirability of training two groups of similar but different individuals slotted to hold the same job title requires analysis of

differential levels of desire/need for training at specific job tasks. The data analysis revealed that the two groups generally prioritize the job tasks for training purposes in the same way but not to an overwhelming degree. Specific areas of difference were noted in section III. Since those differences were based on the rank order comparison of scale means and not on absolute values of item means, the identifiable areas of specific differences in training needs/desires are indicative of the need to maintain consideration of each group's training needs.

BACKGROUND DATA ANALYSIS. The background data analysis further substantiates the existence of two distinct groups with important experiential differences (e.g., time in service, formal training in leadership/human behavior).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE/NAVY PERSPECTIVES CONCERNING ASSIGNMENT AND UTILIZATION OF IET OFFICERS WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR DATA USE

At least three findings in DOD and Navy policies concerning the assignment and utilization of IET officers have a bearing on the purpose of this study (which is to assess the need for specialized leadership training for RTC division officers and, if indicated, to describe relevant training objectives). The three findings are:

- The other three major services each have active, dedicated IET officer training, including topics in leadership.

- The nature of Navy recruit division organization and staffing suggests potentially heavy leadership demands on the Navy RTC division officer.

- The two categories of officers from which RTC division officers are selected include a wide divergence in leadership experience.

The perspective these findings cast on the interpretation and use of the data is discussed below.

OTHER SERVICE IET OFFICER TRAINING. TAEG Report No. 81 reported the existence and nature of extensive IET officer orientation and training programs within the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps. The Army and Marine Corps presently provide/conduct formal training (i.e., a formally developed/instructed course in addition to routine orientation) concerning the duties of IET officers. This training is not limited to just first-line supervisory officers. It is provided, in some instances, to command-level personnel. Specific learning objectives in leadership/organizational effectiveness instruction exist in the officer IET training programs of all three services. Emphasis is placed on officer personal experience of major recruit training evolutions (e.g., obstacle courses, military drill) designed to facilitate/emphasize leadership by example. Table 5 summarizes DOD IET officer training in terms of duration of training and applicable management level for which it is designed.

TABLE 5.   COMPARISON OF ... URATION (IN WORKING DAYS) OF FORMAL DOD IET
OFFICER TRAINING ... AT TWO OFFICER LEVELS

	ARMY	AIR FORCE	USMC	NAVY
Upper level commanders		7*	20	0
First echelon commanders/ supervisors		7*	20	0

*General in scope, not i...

RECRUIT TRAINING COMMAND D... S... ...ZATION/STAFFING CONSIDERATIONS.
Organization/staffing com... ...tween Navy RTC divisions and Navy fleet
divisions as well as between ... ...isions and other service "divisions"
are relevant to the topi... ... officer leadership training.

RTC and Fleet Division Com... ... RTC division officer is routinely
responsible for the effec... ... recruit companies each with two co-
leading petty officers. ... ... officer's supervision of about 28
senior petty officers (w... ... ...ue) and approximately 960 recruits
during a period when most ... ... are experiencing the vicissitudes
of adolescent development ... ...ously undergoing the dramatic change
from civilian to sailor. ... ...uits cannot make this change, the
recruit division officer ... ... responsibility to screen for recruit
suitability for continued ... ... The division officer, the only
officer assigned to the div... ...ically at the O-2/O-3 or W-2/3/4
level. He or she command... ... in which over 23 positions of respon-
sibility subordinate to th... ... commanders are held by new recruits.
Figure 1 illustrates the o... ... structure of the RTC division and
lists the number and rank, ... assigned.

While "division" i... ... ...ribe the basic organizational unit
aboard a ship or other ... ...command, the number of personnel
assigned is much lower. ... ... a small division of less than 20
sailors to perhaps as many ... ...example, the engineering department
of a large aircraft carrier ... ... the officer assigned generally
ranges from ensign to com... ... division size. The occurrences of
junior officers as assist... ... division vary with size. Larger
divisions usually have ad... ... officer assistants. Regardless of
division size, however, th... ... ...ly an infrastructure of experienced
petty officers ranging ... ... of Petty Officer (E-7), Leading
Petty Officer (E-6), sectio... ... center supervisors (E-6s and E-5s),
several other E-5s, numero ... ...nrated individuals. Figure 1 also
illustrates the organizati... ... ...ard shipboard division.

The numbers in figure ... ... the RTC division with the operational
division most sharply in ... ...ty officer to nonrated personnel
ratio, (2) less graduate... ... ...tty officers in varying rates
at all levels of organiza... ... and (3) much higher number of
assigned personnel.

ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL	REPRESENTATIVE FLEET DIVISION*		RECRUIT TRAINING DIVISION	
	Function	Number	Function	Number
FIRST LINE COMMISSIONED OFFICER SUPERVISOR	DIVISION OFFICER	1	DIVISION OFFICER	1
ADDITIONAL COMMISSIONED OFFICERS	JUNIOR DIVISION OFFICER/DIVISION TRAINING OFFICER/TECHNICAL AND MATERIAL ASSISTANCE OFFICER	0		0
COMMISSIONED OFFICER TOTAL		1		1
LEADING PETTY OFFICER STAFF	LEADING CHIEF PETTY OFFICER(S) LEADING PETTY OFFICER(S)		LEADING CHIEF PETTY OFFICER MASTER-AT-ARMS YEOMAN TRAINING ASSISTANT (RTC ORLANDO ONLY)	3(4)
SUB-UNIT LEADERS/SUPERVISORS	WORK CENTER SUPERVISORS/DAMAGE CONTROL PETTY OFFICER(S)		COMPANY COMMANDERS	24
				27
MID-ECHELON PETTY OFFICER	SPECIFIC TASK/JOB SUPERVISORS AND/OR JOURNEYMAN LEVEL TECHNICIANS	6		0
APPRENTICE	APPRENTICE TECHNICIANS	11	RECRUIT TRAINEES	960
ENLISTED TOTAL		24		987

*Fleet Division complements range from approximately 20 members in a small ship to as many as 200 members in the t Division of a carrier. Division Officer rank may vary from Ensign, for typical divisions, to as high as Commander for large divisions. OI Division of an AOR-1 Class Replenishment Oiler was selected because the most frequently listed previous duty assignment of the RTC officers surveyed was an operations division aboard an auxiliary ship.

Sources: OPNAVINST 3120.32A, OPNAVINST 5320.1B

Figure 1. Comparison of Typical Navy Recruit Training Division and a Representative Fleet Division Administrative Organization

Interservice Comparisons. Figure 2 contrasts the RTC division with other service IET counterparts. It contains a comparison of the rank of officers typically assigned to initial entry training units, the number of additional officers assigned to the unit, the officer-to-recruit ratio and officer-to-petty officer/NCO ratio. Examination of the figure reveals the span of personnel responsibility is clearly broader, both with respect to recruits and to petty officers, for the Navy RTC division officer than for his/her counterparts in other services.

LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE VARIATIONS. Another emerging factor in the evaluation of recruit division officer leadership training requirements was the widely divergent levels of leadership experience between the source groups from which they are selected. Navy RTC division officers are predominantly selected from the unrestricted line early in their career following completion of one or two previous tours of duty. For male line officers this usually occurs after the completion of the first sea tour. Infrequently, but occasionally, a female RTC division officer may be serving in her first Navy assignment. In addition to this source, RTC division officers are also selected from two groups of officers who have lengthy prerequisite enlisted experience. These are limited duty officers (LDOs) and chief warrant officers (CWOs). These officers are at their mid or late career points at the time of selection and have had multiple Naval assignments in both enlisted and officer capacities. The leadership training needs of these officers may be significantly different due to these experience variations.

The Navy recruit division officer has a unique responsibility and those selected for the job bring with them a widely divergent base of experience. Both factors make an evaluation of division officer leadership training needs a highly complex problem.

SUMMARY

The data imply that training in specialized RTC leadership job tasks is desirable for both officer groups and that the degree of desirability for the ULO group may be higher than the data reflect. Important differences in stated training needs were noted. Other services are currently addressing specialized leadership training needs of officers assigned to IET "division-sized" units. Consideration of Navy RTC division officer leadership training needs is both timely from an interservice standpoint as well as desired/recommended by the officers surveyed.

SERVICE	TRAINING UNIT TITLE NOTE #3	RANK OF OFFICER	ADDITIONAL OFFICERS ASSIGNED AND FUNCTION	RATIO OF OFFICERS TO RECRUITS	RATIO OF OFFICERS TO PETTY OFFICERS OR NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICER ASSIGNED
NAVY	DIVISION	03-WO-1	NONE	1:960	1:28
ARMY (NOTE #1)	COMPANY	03	02 TRAINING OFFICER	1:110	1:6
AIR FORCE	SQUADRON	04	03 TRAINING OFFICER	1:500	1:25
MARINE CORPS (NOTE #2)	SERIES	02	02 ASSISTANT SERIES COMMANDER	1:160	1:7
COAST GUARD	BATTALION	02	NONE	1:200	1:9

NOTE #1 LIMITED TO BASIC TRAINING. DOES NOT INCLUDE ON-STATION UNIT TRAINING.

NOTE #2 DOES NOT INCLUDE WOMEN MARINE RECRUIT TRAINING AT MCRD PARRIS ISLAND.

NOTE #3 SERVICES VARY WIDELY ON SUPERVISION, ORGANIZATION, AND SUPPORT OF THE TRAINING UNITS LISTED BELOW.

Figure 2. Comparison of Department of Defense and Coast Guard Initial Entry (Recruit) Training First Line Officer Supervisors to Enlisted Supervisors and Trainees

SECTION V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

The survey data support the following conclusions:

- The items listed in the survey are relevant job tasks for RTC division officers.

- Both officer groups surveyed expressed the opinion that:

  .. their prior experience provided adequate preparation for performing the listed tasks, however,

  .. formal training in selected survey tasks would be desirable.

- Training in the five tasks receiving the highest ranks by LDO/CWOs on the desirability of training scale may constitute an essential training requirement for RTC division officers. (See the first recommendation for specific tasks.)

- Differences exist between ULOs and LDO/CWOs in their:

  .. leadership experience
  .. prior leadership training and education
  .. rate of request for current assignment
  .. intent to remain on active duty after their RTC assignment
  .. the frequency of performance of the surveyed tasks
  .. perceived level of preparation for the performance of the surveyed tasks
  .. desire for formal leadership training in the surveyed tasks.

- In addition to the essential training requirements identified above, additional training might also be desirable at other surveyed job tasks.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations contained in TAEG Report No. 81 included the establishment of a standardized orientation/indoctrination curriculum for RTC division officers. Suggested topical outlines included leadership instruction in:

- tec... ues for supervision, counseling, and personal adjustment for the division officer

- administration of extra military instruction and other nonpunitive measures.

Furthermore, appendix C to TAEG Report No. 81 contains preliminary findings of the survey data discussed in this report.

The recommendations contained in this report are designed to assist in the identification of specific learning/training objectives. It is, however, beyond the scope of this report to identify all of the necessary/ desired learning objectives for RTC division officer leadership training.

Recent Navy leadership training research has focused on determining leadership instructional content by identifying job behavior that differentiates superior from average performers with a view toward training leaders to perform those behaviors (see Klemp, Munger, and Spencer, 1977). The present study was conducted to provide information about current leadership training needs of prospective RTC division officers and to guide the direction of future research.

It is recommended that:

- training for the following five tasks be considered for inclusion in the current officer orientation/training program at each RTC utilizing, as instructors and curriculum developers, experienced line and staff corps officers (legal officers, chaplains, and psychologists) and successful company commanders currently assigned to the RTCs or RTC support commands.

  - informing recruits of the positive aspects of the Navy as an employer, in conjunction with counseling sessions (e.g., educational programs, advancement, pay, medical benefits, travel, chance to switch ratings)

  - informing recruits of the types of discharges and benefits gained or lost as a result of each, emphasizing effects of certain types of discharges on the individual's future opportunities

  - choosing the best disposition for poorly motivated and/or misbehaving recruits that will optimize his/her chances for successful completion of training (e.g., refer to chaplain, NJP, Special Training Division, Return to Duty)

  - recognizing and using extra control measures when recruit behavior becomes particularly disruptive or potentially dangerous (e.g., creating "uproar" through suicide gestures, threats of going UA, getting staff members pitted against one another)

  - changing chronic failure oriented recruit behavior (e.g., counseling a recruit who has dropped out of school, run away from home, been fired from previous jobs, now wants out of Navy, but has potential for successful Naval career).

- training in surveyed job tasks other than those identified above be initiated on the basis of the priority indicated and resources available.

- the data for all 51 tasks listed in table 3 be considered along
  with the content analysis of Behavioral Event Interview data
  (Klemp, et al., 1977) in the development of the "Shore Based"
  Officer Leadership and Management Education and Training (LMET)
  course development.

REFERENCES

Copeland, D. R., Henry, J. M., Mew, D. V., and Cordell, C. C. Navy Recruit Training Optimization, Post-1980, Phase I: Current Assessment and Concept for the Future. TAEG Report No. 34. May 1976. Training Analysis and Evaluation Group, Orlando, FL. (ADA026528)

Copeland, D. R., Henry, J. M., and Mew, D. V. Navy Recruit Training Optimization, Post-1980: Training System Design and a Plan for Implementation. TAEG Report No. 67. December 1978. Training Analysis and Evaluation Group, Orlando, FL.

Copeland, D. R., Mew, D. V., Henry, J. M., and Curry, T. F., Jr. Navy Recruit Training Optimization, Post-1980, Phase II: Current Assessment and Options for Navy Apprentice Training. TAEG Report No. 53. February 1978. Training Analysis and Evaluation Group, Orlando, FL. (ADA053007)

Curry, T. F., Jr. and Copeland, D. R. Selection, Training, and Utilization of Navy Recruit Training Command Officers. TAEG Report No. 81. May 1980. Training Analysis and Evaluation Group, Orlando, FL. (ADA086403)

Curry, T. F., Jr., Copeland, D. R., Henry, J. M., and Mew, D. V. Selection and Training of Navy Recruit Company Commanders. TAEG Report No. 62. September 1978. Training Analysis and Evaluation Group, Orlando, FL. (ADA062647)

Klemp, G. O., Munger, M. T., and Spencer, L. M. Analysis of Leadership and Management Competencies of Commissioned and Noncommissioned Naval Officers in the Pacific and Atlantic Fleets. Task Planning Document EG-33, Contract N00600-75-D-0038. August 1977. McBer and Company, Boston, MA.

Russel, M. M. and Stein, D. K. Integration of McBer's Competency Assessment and Course Design and Evaluation Procedures with the Navy Instructional System Development (ISD) Model. Manuscript form. October 1980. McBer and Company, Boston, MA.

APPENDIX A

TRAINING ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION GROUP RECRUIT
TRAINING COMMAND OFFICER TRAINING SURVEY

This appendix contains a copy of the Training Analysis and Evaluation Group Recruit Training Command Officer Training Survey. This was used as the primary instrument for collecting data about the training needs of RTC division officers.

TRAINING ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION GROUP RECRUIT TRAINING COMMAND OFFICER TRAINING SURVEY

TAEG REPRESENTATIVES:

Doug Copeland	AV 791-5198
Tom Curry	5673
Jim Henry	5673
Herschel Hughes, Jr.	4367

BACKGROUND

The Training Analysis and Evaluation Group (TAEG) is working with the Chief of Naval Education and Training (CNET) in considering the desireability and feasibility of providing standardized job training, in addition to current command orientation programs, to new officers assigned to Recruit Training Commands (particularly to those officers going to division officer billets).

Earlier this year, a TAEG representative interviewed ten officers at RTC, Great Lakes, and thirteen officers at RTC, Orlando, concerning the desireability of a training program. Ideas were also solicited about possible topics. These ideas, in job task form, have been put into this survey for review by a larger sample of officers.

DIRECTIONS

The purpose of the survey is to obtain information concerning the duties and functions of recruit training division officers. This information may be used to develop a training program for future division officers.

The following pages list tasks, functions and experiences, which typical division officers may perform or experience. Please indicate how often you perform these tasks, your preparation for their performance and whether you think training would be beneficial for future division officers. Complete the survey by placing a check in one of the three boxes for each question at the right of each task statement. Base your selection of categories on your experience as an RTC division officer during your first few months of duty.

After you have completed marking the survey for the job tasks listed, add any other job tasks which you think should be listed. Answer the same three questions, at the right, for those tasks, as well.

35

	HOW OFTEN DO YOU DO THIS TASK?		HOW WELL PREPARED WERE YOU TO DO THIS TASK WHEN IT WAS FIRST REQUIRED?			DO YOU CONSIDER FORMAL TRAINING IN THIS AREA TO BE:		
	Frequently	Seldom	Well	Adequately	Not at all	Not necessary	Desirable but not essential	Essential
1. Apply fleet experience to correct command/departmental/divisional behavior and attitude problems								
2. Discuss your own model of human behavior in connection with the behavior of staff members and recruits (i.e. explain why certain people are behaving the way they are, etc.)								
3. Apply theories and research findings found in current human resource management literature to correct command/departmental/divisional behavior and attitude problems								
4. Apply theories and research findings of documented management studies and scientific research in military recruit training to correct command/ departmental/divisional behavior and attitude problems								
5. Submit written recommendations for improvements in command/departmental/ divisional behavior and attitude problems								
6. Reinforce acceptable behavior and attitudes of division staff members and company commanders with rewards (e.g. verbal compliments, high marks on evaluations, awards, etc.)								
7. Achieve compliance by division staff members and company commanders with changes in command/departmental/divisional policy and directives								

36

TASK STATEMENTS	HOW OFTEN DO YOU DO THIS TASK?			HOW WELL PREPARED WERE YOU TO DO THIS TASK WHEN IT WAS FIRST REQUIRED?			DO YOU CONSIDER FORMAL TRAINING IN THIS AREA TO BE:		
	Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Not at all	Adequately	Well	Not necessary	Desireable but not essential	Essential
8. Achieve/maintain division officer authority over daily operation of division.									
9. Achieve/maintain respect and credibility with division staff members and assigned company commanders									
10. Coach company commanders and division staff members on his/her marginally acceptable/unacceptable behavior (e.g. failure to arrive on time, alleged maltreatment of a recruit, etc.)									
11. Coach company commanders and division staff members on his/her training unit's marginally acceptable/unacceptable behavior (e.g. slow progress in training, poor discipline in ranks, etc.)									
12. Monitor potential for divisional staff/company commander/recruit maltreatment of recruit									
13. Discuss/resolve differences of opinion with division staff members about recommended recruit dispositions									
14. Relieve a company commander of his training unit									

TASK STATEMENTS	HOW OFTEN DID YOU PERFORM THIS TASK			WERE YOU COMPLETELY PREPARED TO DO THIS TASK WHEN IT WAS FIRST REQUIRED?			DO YOU CONSIDER FORMAL TRAINING IN THIS AREA TO BE:		
	Never	Occassionally	Frequently	Not at all	Adequately	Well	Not necessary	Desireable but not essential	Essential
15. Monitor potential for division staff/company commander/recruit use of abusive language toward recruits									
16. Reinforce acceptable behavior and attitudes with rewards (e.g. verbal compliments, high evaluation marks, awards, etc.)									
17. Distinguish which recruits with whom to invest the majority of available counseling time									
18. Distinguish between recruits who may accept directive counseling (e.g. advice giving, pep talks, verbal punishments, etc.) from those that may be more effectively helped from indirect means (e.g. listening, ventilation of feelings, etc.)									
19. Distinguish between occassions in a recruit counseling session when direct/indirect counseling techniques would be most helpful									
20. Confront a recruit(s) concerning his/her unacceptable behavior/attitude									
21. Punish verbally a recruit(s) for unacceptable behavior/attitude									

TASK STATEMENTS	Essential	Desireable but not essential	Not necessary	Well	Adequately	Not at all	Frequently	Occassionally	Never
22. Assign punishment to a recruit(s) for performing an unacceptable behavior or expressing an unacceptable attitude									
23. Inform recruits of positive aspects of Navy as an employer, in conjunction with counseling sessions (e.g. educational programs, advancement, pay, medical benefits, travel, chance to switch ratings, etc.)									
24. Inform recruits of necessary negative aspects of Navy as an employer, in conjunction with counseling sesssions (e.g. separations from family, arduous sea duty, frequent reassignments, etc.)									
25. Instruct recruits in military customs and traditions (e.g. saluting, sounding off, proper wearing of uniform, individual and unit drill, etc.)									
26. Inform recruits of various options for expressing personal complaints/problems (e.g. chain-of-command, CO's Request Mast, chaplains, psychologists, etc.)									
27. Distinguish between various support personnel for referral of recruits for assistance/disposition (e.g. psychologist, chaplain, medical officer, legal officer, etc.)									
28. Coordinate disposition of recruits referred to various support personnel for assistance/disposition (i.e. exchange correspondence, discuss disposition rationale, resolve differences, effect disposition, etc.)									

Column group headings:
- HOW ESSENTIAL... FORMAL TRAINING IN THIS AREA TO BE: (Essential / Desireable but not essential / Not necessary)
- HOW WELL DID YOU... TASK WHEN IT WAS FIRST REQUIRED? (Well / Adequately / Not at all)
- (Frequently / Occassionally / Never)

TASK STATEMENT	HOW OFTEN DO YOU DO THIS TASK?			HOW WELL PREPARED WERE YOU TO DO THIS TASK WHEN IT WAS FIRST REQUIRED?			DO YOU CONSIDER FORMAL TRAINING IN THIS AREA TO BE:		
	Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Not at all	Adequately	Well	Not necessary	Desirable but not essential	Essential
29. Inform recruits of types of discharges and benefits gained or lost as a result of each, emphasizing effects of certain type discharges on the individual's future opportunities									
30. Distinguish between recruits progressing slowly primarily because of a need for academic remediation and those progressing slowly primarily because of a lack of motivation for Navy life									
31. Choose the disposition for poorly motivated and/or misbehaving recruits that will optimize his/her chances for successful completion of training (e.g. refer to chaplain, NJP, Special Training Division; RTD, etc.)									
32. Instruct recruits in the proper use of the chain-of-command and the responsibilities inherent in General Order 21									
33. Encourage, verbally, optimum performance from groups of recruits (e.g. training unit pep talks, sports day briefings, etc.)									
34. Conduct personnel inspections as an evaluation of training unit and individual progress									
35. Conduct barracks inspections as an evaluation of training unit and individual progress									

TASK STATEMENTS	DO YOU OFTEN PERFORM THIS TASK?			HOW WELL PREPARED WERE YOU TO DO THIS TASK WHEN IT WAS FIRST REQUIRED?			DO YOU CONSIDER FORMAL TRAINING IN THIS AREA TO BE:		
	Never	Occassionally	Frequently	Not at all	Adequately	Well	Not necessary	Desireable but not essential	Essential
36. Instruct recruits in basic mission and roles of the Navy and potential enemy threats									
37. Resolve/avoid power struggles with angry or insubordinate recruits									
38. Control your own behavior when angry or greatly dissappointed with a recruit's behavior/attitude									
39. Listen to a recruit talk about a training and/or personal problem (i.e. facilitate his expression of feelings, definition cf problem, exploration of options, etc.)									
40. Recognize need for and maintain control of recruit's behavior when he/she may be trying to create maximum uproar through expanding the seriousness of his/her misbehavior/acting out (e.g. suicide gestures, threats of going UA, getting staff members pitted against one another, etc.)									
41. Change chronic failure oriented recruit behavior (e.g. recruit dropped out of school, ran away from home, was fired from job, now wants out of Navy, and has good "A" school, etc.)									
42. Distinguish which recruits to recommend for unsuitability discharge and which to return to duty (e.g. situations that occur in Division Officer Mast, RABs. NABs. etc.)									

TASK STATEMENTS	HOW OFTEN DO YOU DO THIS TASK?			HOW WELL PREPARED WERE YOU TO DO THIS TASK WHEN IT WAS FIRST REQUIRED?			DO YOU CONSIDER FORMAL TRAINING IN THIS AREA TO BE:		
	Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Not at all	Adequately	Well	Not necessary	Desirable but not essential	Essential
43. Interpret significance of recruit's past history of psychiatric care and/or alcohol/drug abuse on suitability for training									
44. Coordinate with medical officer concerning optimum training/health care disposition for recruit patients									
45. Coordinate with legal officer concerning optimum training/legal disposition for recruits with legal problems (e.g. fraudulent enlistments, UA, etc.)									
46. Coordinate with psychologist/psychiatrist concerning optimum training/ health care disposition for recruits with past history or current involvement with psychiatric care, suicide attempts/gestures, alcohol/drug abuse, etc.									
47. Cope with day to day stress of managing/counseling large adolescent population									
48. Adjust to increase in perceived personal power that may seem to accrue (i.e. avoid warden/prisoner syndrome)									
49. Cope with multiple command/departmental/divisional goals that may, at times, seem to oppose each other (e.g. maintain low attrition while screening out unsuitable recruits, etc.)									

	DO YOU PERFORM THIS TASK?			HOW WELL PREPARED WERE YOU TO DO THIS TASK WHEN IT WAS FIRST REQUIRED?			DO YOU CONSIDER FORMAL TRAINING IN THIS AREA TO BE:		
TASK STATEMENTS	Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Not at all	Adequately	Well	Not necessary	Desirable but not essential	Essential
50. Adjust to assignment at RTC (e.g. plan career based on influence of assignment, adjust from variety of sea duty to routine of shore duty, develop personally, challenging job role, adjust to decreased contact between officers due to different buildings/distances, etc.)									
51. Adjust to going from enlisted status to WO/LDO status									

APPENDIX B

BACKGROUND DATA FORM

This appendix contains a copy of the form used for collecting background information from RTC division officers.

BACKGROUND DATA

Completion of this Background Data form may allow the TAEG representatives investigating standardized RTC division officer training an opportunity to learn of possible relationships between professional experience and preparation for duty at RTCs. Your answers to the last two questions may provide useful insights for further analysis and follow-up.

RANK:_____DESIGNATOR:_____YEARS COMMISSIONED SERVICE:_____

YEARS ENLISTED SERVICE:_____HIGHEST RATE/RATING:_____

BILLET/TYPE OF COMMAND OF PREVIOUS TOUR:_____

NUMBER OF WEEKS BETWEEN REPORTING ABOARD AND BEGINNING TO FUNCTION AS AN RTC DIVISION OFFICER:_____

DID YOU REQUEST ASSIGNMENT TO A RECRUIT TRAINING COMMAND?   YES/NO

CAREER PLANS: REMAIN ACTIVE DUTY_____
                TRANSFER TO NAVAL RESERVE_____
                DISSASSOCIATE WITH THE NAVAL SERVICE_____
                UNCERTAIN_____

FORMAL TRAINING IN HUMAN BEHAVIOR (PSYCHOLOGY, COUNSELING, LEADERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, ETC.) (CIVILIAN AND MILITARY)

_____

_____

_____

WHAT ARE YOUR PRIMARY PERSONAL REWARDS FROM WORKING IN THE RTC ENVIRONMENT?

_____

_____

_____

_____

WHAT DO YOU THINK ARE THE MAJOR CHALLENGES FACING RECRUIT TRAINING IN THE YEARS AHEAD? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

MEAN RATING SCALE VALUES FOR ALL RESPONSE CATEGORIES
FOR ALL SURVEYED TASKS BY TYPE OFFICER

This appendix contains the mean rating scale values for all surveyed tasks by type of officer.

MEAN RATING SCALE VALUES FOR ALL RESPONSE CATEGORIES FOR
ALL SURVEYED TASKS BY TYPE OFFICER

Survey Item Number	Mean Rating Scale Values					
	Frequency of Performance		Level of Preparation		Desirability of Formal Training	
	ULO	LDO/CWO	ULO	LDO/CWO	ULO	LDO/CWO
1	1.72	1.62	1.61	1.77	.57	.67
2	1.57	1.00	1.43	1.33	.87	1.08
3	.87	.91	1.10	.92	.86	.85
4	.53	.27	.63	.50	.9	1.10
5	1.30	1.00	1.30	1.46	.53	.2
6	1.93	1.54	1.87	1.54	.83	.59
7	1.77	1.54	1.55	1.69	.66	.85
8	1.83	1.67	1.77	1.83	.60	.83
9	1.97	1.67	1.79	1.67	.57	.75
10	1.24	1.00	1.52	1.64	.77	1.00
11	1.14	1.09	1.46	1.70	.90	1.18
12	1.52	1.38	1.47	1.75	.87	1.31
13	1.52	1.36	1.56	1.80	.69	.82
14	.66	.55	1.19	1.50	.89	1.00
15	1.31	1.31	1.36	1.54	.45	.77
16	1.55	1.45	1.50	1.73	.52	.82
17	1.72	1.45	1.44	1.55	.75	1.36
18	1.79	1.42	1.29	1.42	.86	1.25
19	1.76	1.58	1.26	1.42	.86	1.33
20	1.93	1.69	1.46	1.62	.79	1.00
21	1.72	1.54	1.43	1.62	.62	1.23
22	1.86	1.58	1.28	1.83	.79	1.33
23	1.69	1.54	1.62	1.54	.97	1.75
24	1.41	1.23	1.52	1.77	.72	1.23
25	1.69	1.38	1.48	1.54	.79	1.08
26	1.62	1.38	1.59	1.54	.72	1.15
27	1.76	1.54	1.45	1.62	.79	1.31
28	1.59	1.25	1.39	1.42	.89	1.36
29	1.28	1.25	1.07	1.42	.93	1.55
30	1.72	1.67	1.29	1.50	.86	1.33
31	1.90	1.67	1.24	1.58	.90	1.50
32	1.54	1.27	1.50	1.64	.62	1.27
33	1.41	1.27	1.43	1.36	.55	.91
34	1.45	1.00	1.30	1.36	.72	1.00
35	1.28	1.09	1.07	1.45	.83	1.00
36	1.03	1.00	1.41	1.67	.57	1.30
37	1.24	1.00	1.39	1.64	.62	1.09
38	1.50	1.54	1.71	1.69	.55	1.08
39	1.69	1.67	1.64	1.67	.72	1.33
40	1.38	1.33	1.32	1.58	.97	1.50
41	1.52	1.33	1.21	1.42	.93	1.50
42	1.80	1.75	1.31	1.67	.90	1.42
43	1.10	1.00	1.21	1.08	1.00	1.36
44	1.04	1.00	1.11	1.00	.61	1.30
45	1.21	1.00	1.14	1.27	.66	1.18
46	1.14	1.08	1.14	1.25	.83	1.25
47	1.66	1.67	1.39	1.33	.79	1.25
48	1.11	.82	1.38	1.50	.63	1.25
49	1.63	1.46	1.23	1.31	.73	1.31
50	1.15	1.09	1.30	1.54	.50	.67
51	.25	1.00	.33	1.46	.67	.75

APPENDIX D

COMMENTS ABOUT PERSONAL JOB REWARDS AND OPINIONS ABOUT
MAJOR CHALLENGES FACING RECRUIT TRAINING

This appendix provides information about the personal opinions of the respondents with respect to present and future recruit training issues.

The following comments were made by the officers surveyed in response to the question:

"What are your primary personal rewards from working in the RTC environment?"

1. Being in a position where I can support the 200 some odd company commanders assigned to Code 40.

2. Working with young people, seeing them develop from a civilian into a sailor. Secondarily, working closely with females.

3. Incredible opportunity to practice counseling skills. Excellent experience coordinating and monitoring division activities.

4. My leadership has matured as a result of the intense environment here at RTC. A minimum of 3 years in the fleet - sea duty - should be a prerequisite for assignment here; the experience gained at sea is essential. Females should have some other large scale leadership experience. It is a pleasure working with such outstanding enlisted staff. As a result of my exprience at RTC, I feel I have become an effective manager and division officer. It's a challenging responsibility controlling a building and up to 1,000 recruits.

5. Seeing highly motivated, intelligent young people going to the fleet.

6. A job well done results in a decent sailor in the fleet.

7. Few. We operate on the caboose of a long train. We rarely see good recruits. Seeing a disorganized group develop into a self-conscious team is good, as is taking an aware part in that development.

8. Being able to shape and motivate future fleet personnel. Also, I feel that I am gaining a great deal of insight into basic human behavior which will be invaluable to me when I return to sea duty. I greatly enjoy working with such a competent and highly qualified enlisted staff.

9. The challenge of motivating individuals, primarily those with bad attitudes, toward a positive outlook on the Navy. A great deal of leadership experience. The opportunity to work with some really outstanding enlisted personnel.

10. Here more than any other place in the Navy, a supervisor is able to apply his LMT. On board ship people are talked up but often the mission overrides those considerations; here the mission is the people. Those recruits that overcome their problems, due in large part to your counseling, are the reward.

11. Working with some of the finest Navy personnel (staff) that could be gathered in one command. The _____ area is one of the best areas I have seen for a duty station.

12. Working with top-notch officer and enlisted staff members; working directly with company commanders; seeing positive results of counseling recruits (i.e., completion of training, increased motivation, enthusiasm).

13. Pride in the fleet that I helped to change a young man from civilian environment to military, and helping to screen out the undesirables.

14. Preparation of young men to live aboard ship and to improve their values.

15. "None."

16. This assignment has been a refreshing change for me and I am enjoying for the first time a feeling of accomplishment in a "crisis management" free atmosphere.

17. One of the most personally rewarding assignments I've ever had. I really enjoy working with recruits. I would be willing to stay here 2 or 3 more years.

18. "None."

19. Turning out to the fleet the best of what we have to work with.

20. Having an input into the training of recruits for fleet duty. Knowing that through counseling and understanding some so called bad recruits can be brought around and leave RTC a squared away, motivated sailor.

21. Not going to sea.

22. I enjoy counseling recruits.

23. Interactions with recruits.

24. Ability to assist and motivate a new group of men. Watching the military development of a new sailor.

25. Not being tied down to a desk.

26. Adequate opportunity for off-duty education.

27. Satisfaction in seeing civilians transformed into sailors.

28. Satisfaction in seeing counseling pay off.

29. Satisfaction of turning certain recruits around to become sailors.

30. I enjoy working with the recruits. They are fascinating. It is very satisfying to watch the changes that happen in an 18-year old individual in 8 short weeks. Most of the recruits age 4-5 years mentally while they are here (going) from adolescence to adulthood.

31. I derive great personal satisfaction in helping a marginal recruit see the worth in himself and successfully complete training. I also enjoy interviewing the outstanding recruits who I believe make up the majority of our manpower.

32. To observe a recruit respond to authority, maintain or acquire self-discipline and benefit from military training at RTC.

33. Working with top-notch enlisted personnel, getting good recruits to the fleet and throwing the bad ones out.

34. Working with recruits.

35. Self-satisfaction at developing young men for future useful Naval service, and feeling that marginal or substandard recruits are not put in the fleet.

36. Great amount of experience gained. Rewards from helping people and feeling like job is very important in support of fleet defense effort.

37. Doing an important job for the Navy.

38. Working with good quality c/c's and recruits.

39. Helping a recruit deal with problems.

40. Home nights and weekends.

41. Self-satisfaction from working with the human being.

The following comments were made by the officers surveyed in response to the question:

"What do you think are the major challenges facing recruit training in the years ahead?"

1. The ever-decreasing quality to meet quantity required. (Elimination of the draft was a gross mistake and has eliminated the top 10 percent of available resources.)

2. Military discipline.

3. Time and money constraints reducing the effectiveness of recruit training.

4. Maintaining a cadre of qualified c/c's. Staffing shortages are causing excessive demands on many c/c's. The long term result will be that personnel will be reluctant to return to the type of duty for a second or subsequent tour.

5. Expanded female population within the Navy coupled with a downward trend in education level of recruits.

6. Same as always. Motivate recruits toward a productive tour of duty/career. (I felt that another answer column was needed several times under "how well prepared" namely "barely.")

7. Deteriorating benefits, perceived or real, will result in a poorer quality of recruit, making retention/training increasingly difficult. Maintaining standards is truly going to become a challenge.

8. It's going to be difficult to convince career officers that assignment to RTC is not a recommendation for early separation, particularly since they did not volunteer for this assignment. The CNO's message notwithstanding, aviators are facing 2 years out of the cockpit with no hope of proficiency flying.

9. Adjusting to the Spanish speaking recruits who will probably have to augment our quotas.

10. Our remedial training (reading and math) is going to boom.

11. The importance of the mission of the Navy will be less significant as recruits will be further away from last world war (my Dad told me old war stories, but will theirs?).

12. Getting rid of the dead weight and being able to work with the quality of people we are recruiting.

13. Recruits are going to be less intellectually talented. Attitudes concerning group identification and involvement have changed, and the kids are harder to convince/coach. A totally new management perspective is necessary in order to successfully lead young people who were raised in an era of disillusionment and alienation. (Hell! I'm disillusioned and alienated, and I'm educated! How are the dummies going to cope?)

14. Lower standards will tend to reduce and further degrade the Navy's readiness and effectiveness and will place a burden on the RTC staff.

15. Recruit training commands should "decide" to increase their attrition level. I fail to understand the reason for sending hopeless and helpless individuals into the fleet where they will perform little, cost a lot, and tend to boost fleet attrition levels.

16. Increased public dislike for the military will cause recruiting goals to continue to fall off and more low quality "quota" gathering will ensue which will tend to degrade the command's mission due to a larger quantity of social misfits.

17. Officers' tours of duty should be equalized to 3 years for all. This is a very rewarding and challenging job, yet we can become disenchanted when faced with just a short 2 year tour; while others, often less qualified officers, have 3 year tours.

18. Deciding how to deal with a recruit who knows the Navy can do <u>nothing</u> to him after he or she does whatever they want to. A recruit can refuse to do anything - even refuse punishment and the worst that happens is a discharge under honorable conditions. Adding to that is an apparent lack of self-discipline and respect for authority among many of today's recruits.

19. The lowering of the quality of input recruits will do little to help the fleet. In our more complex environment the need for skilled as well as willing personnel will be an overriding factor to bodies. RTC attrition will climb and SSCs will climb and the fleet will be worse off in its critical rates.

20. The Navy is not recruiting the caliber individual that is required for the Navy to continue to function effectively. The 8 weeks of RTC helps to turn a small part of these marginal individuals around so that they may contribute, but a large amount slip through and these are the ones that are drawing the Navy down. The tools available at RTC for disciplining recruits are not adequate and need to be strengthened if we are to send well disciplined sailors to the fleet.

21. The challenge has been and will continue to be the necessity for teaching the military type of life to potential sailors. Perhaps the hardest thing to do is to somehow teach this "instant gratification" generation of recruits the values of responsibility, accountability, professionalism and attention to detail. Thirty-eight training days is a pitifully short time in which to UNLEARN 18 years of selfishness and irresponsibility - recruit training's "track record" in this area is outstanding though!

22. Caliber of young men entering the service. The permissive society that the young man comes from will make it more difficult for him to adapt to the restrictive environment of a training command and the Navy, in general.

23. Getting money from DOD to train our people.

24. Declining quality of recruits.

25. Meeting the needs of the fleet with recruits which are a product of a permissive and degenerate civilian society.

26. The quality of enlistees will continue to drop because of poor incentives offered by USN service compared to new, and often better, incentives offered by civilian industry.

27. Cannot adequately answer this complex question without the necessary time to consider all aspects of the question.

28. Turning out to the fleet the best of what we have to work with.

29. Being able to encourage and motivate the modern young recruit who has been brought up as a free running, marginally educated kid.

30. Teaching them to read and write.

31. Upgrading the quality of sailor in the fleet.

32. Retention.

33. Receiving the same loyalty, dedication and high standards from senior petty officers as was received in years past.

34. The same problems that face society as a whole.

35. The future of the military establishment.

36. Decreasing trend in quality of recruits.

37. Decrease in quality of recruits and lack of money available to Navy as a whole.

38. The major challenge facing recruit training is to balance the need for reduced attrition rates and yet still maintain quality in the Navy. Due to the shrinking pool of personnel in the age bracket that become recruits, there is a constant increase in pressure on recruiters to meet their quotas. This results in a never ending effort to lower standards so that more and more people will be eligible. The pressure is also coming from inside the Navy to reduce attrition rates at the RTCs (at the same time that standards for enlistment are being lowered). I believe that if the standards were raised there would be less attrition and consequently quotas could be lowered. (I also feel that this will not happen as the emphasis in the Navy is on numbers and not quality.)

39. I feel the people we are getting now are the same as the people we've had for 10 or 20 years or more. We seem to attrite about the same numbers each year and the recruits going out the gate are as enthusiastic, optimistic, and excited as we could hope, en route to their new duty station. This is where the real challenge lies for the Navy. What does a sailor experience in his first 6-18 months after boot camp? (... I strongly feel that the Navy already has all the necessary schools it needs for a division officer to do an outstanding job.)

40. Instilling military pride and motivation into a less educated, often unmotivated population.

41. To turn out well disciplined recruits who have good attitudes toward the military. To keep or instill a high degree of professionalism and pride in them and have them maintain those qualities in the fleet. To have a well educated Navy.

42. Maintaining high standards in the face of a falling retention rate and a decrease in the quality of recruit.

43. I think some people are trying to shorten the program - that would be poor judgment.

44. Impossible congressional actions to impede allotments and interference in Navy's business will eventually eliminate boot camp as it is today.

45. Increase quality of recruits, reinstitute the draft. Reduce fleet attrition rate by improved leadership, pay, benefits, quality of Navy personnel. Improve communications with legislature to support military rather than functioning as deterrent to defense effort.

46. Transforming the steadily declining quality of recruit into productive sailors.

47. Attempting to adequately train recruits with less assets, shorter training time, and more restrictions on discipline of recruits.

48. To continue training properly with budget restrictions and lowering of standards. It's the Navy's problem.

49. Adjusting to the poor opinion the civilian community has for the Department of Defense while trying to produce motivated and trainable sailors.

50. Each recruit, each situation is different, no training can replace experience.

51. Lack of good raw material.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Navy

OASN (R&D, MRA&L)
CNO (OP-115, M. Malehorn; OP-987H, Dr. R. Smith; OP-987; OP-12; OP-01D; OP-62)
NAVCOMPT (NCD-7)
ONR (458 (2 copies), 455)
CNM (MAT-08T2, Mr. A. L. Rubinstein)
CNET (01, 02, N-5, 003, 012, 014 (2 copies), N-2 (2 copies))
CNAVRES (02)
COMNAVSEASYSCOM (05L1C, 05L1C2)
COMNAVAIRSYSCOM (03, 340F, 413G)
CNTECHTRA (017, Dr. Kerr (5 copies); 016 (5 copies); 005; N-6 (2 copies))
CNATRA (Library)
COMTRALANT
COMTRALANT (Educational Advisor)
COMTRAPAC (2 copies)
CO NAVPERSRANDCEN (Library (4 copies))
NAVPERSRANDCEN Liaison (021)
Superintendent NAVPGSCOL (2124, 32)
Superintendent Naval Academy Annapolis (Chairman, Behavioral Science Dept.)
CO NAVEDTRAPRODEVCEN (AH3; EAT, Dr. Smith; Technical Library (2 copies))
CO NAVEDTRASUPPCEN NORVA (00 (2 copies); N1111, Mr. Fazio)
CO NAVEDTRASUPPCENPAC (5 copies)
CO NAVAEROMEDRSCHLAB (Chief Aviation Psych. Div.)
CO FLECOMBATRACENPAC
CO NAMTRAGRU
CO NAVTECHTRACEN Corry Station (101B, 3330, Cryptologic Training Department)
CO NAVTRAEQUIPCEN (TIC (2 copies), N-211, N-001, N-002)
Center for Naval Analyses (2 copies)
U.S. Naval Institute (CDR Bowler)
OIC NODAC (2)
CO TRITRAFAC (2 copies)
CO NAVSUBTRACENPAC (2 copies)
CO FLEASWTRACENPAC
CO FLETRACEN SDIEGO
CISO, SSC GLAKES
Executive Director NAVINSTPRODEVDET
CISO (Code 700), Meridian
Office of Civilian Personnel, Southern Field Division (Jim Herndon)
VT-10 (Education Specialist)
CO NAVSUBSCOL NLON (Code 0110)
CO NAVTECHTRACEN Treasure Island (Technical Library)
TAEG Liaison, CNET 022 (5 copies)
CO NAVCRUITRACOM SDiego (5 copies)
CO NAVCRUITRACOM Orlando (5 copies)
CO NAVCRUITRACOM GLakes (5 copies)
CO NAVREGMEDCEN (REU) GLakes
CO NAVREGMEDCEN Orlando
CO NAVREGMED Diego (MCRD Annex (REU))
CO HUMRESMANSCOL (2 copies)

DISTRIBUTION LIST (continued)

Navy (continued)

CHBUMED (ADDU - Code 71P)
USNA (Dept. of Leadership and Law)
CO NAVADMINCOM (Senior Chaplain, RTC Chaplain) SDiego
CO NAVADMINCOM (Senior Chaplain, RTC Chaplain) Orlando
CO NAVADMINCOM (Senior Chaplain, RTC Chaplain) GLakes

Air Force

Headquarters, Air Training Command (XPTD, Dr. Schufletowski; XPT1A, Mr. Goldman;
    DCS/TTA, Mr. Neale), Randolph Air Force Base
Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Brooks Air Force Base
Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (Library), Lowry Air Force Base
Air Force Office of Scientific Research/AR (Dr. A. R. Fregly)
Headquarters, Tactical Air Command (DOOS), Langley Air Force Base
AFMTC/XR (Capt. Englebretson), Lackland Air Force Base
Headquarters, 34 TATG/TTD (Lt. Col Lee), Little Rock Air Force Base
Headquarters, MAC/DOTF (Capt. Orler), Scott Air Force Base
Headquarters, Basic Military Training School, Lackland Air Force Base

Army

Commandant, TRADOC (Technical Library, ATTG-1)
ARI (Dr. Ralph R. Canter, 316C; Dr. Edgar Johnson; Mr. James Baker;
    Dr. H. F. O'Neil, Jr.; Dr. Beatrice Farr, PERI OK)
ARI Field Unit - Fort Leavenworth
ARI (Reference Service)
ARI Field Unit - Fort Knox (PERI-IK)
COM USA Armament Materiel Readiness Command (DRSAR-MAS)

Coast Guard

Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard Headquarters (G-P-1/2/42, GRT/54)

Marine Corps

Headquarters, USMC (TRS)
CMC (OT)
CGMCDEC (Mr. Greenup)
Director, Marine Corps Institute
CO MARCORCOMMELECSCOL (Col. Evans)
CGMCRD (G-3), Parris Island
CGMCRD (G-3), SDiego

DISTRIBUTION LIST (continued)

Other

Military Assistant for Human Resources, OUSDR&E, Pentagon (CDR Paul Chatelier)
Program Manager, Office of Cybernetics Technology, Defense Advanced Research
        Projects Agency
Institute for Defense Analyses (Dr. Jesse Orlansky)
COM National Cryptologic School (Code E-2)
Director, Center for Educational Technology, FSU
Center for Needs Assessment and Planning, FSU

Information Exchanges

DTIC (12 copies)
DLSIE (Mr. James Dowling)
Executive Editor, Psychological Abstracts, America Psychological Association
ERIC Processing and Reference Facility, Bethesda,   (2 copies)